

In the Claims:

Cancel claims 1 to 11 and insert the enclosed new claims 12 to 23.

REMARKS

The amendments to the specification correct minor clerical and grammatical errors. The two paragraphs added on specification page 2 correspond to the two new independent claims 12 and 21. The amendment at page 5, line 8 aptly describes the FIG. 2 roof shape. Thus the amendments to the specification add no new matter.

Claims 12 to 23 are in the application. All of these claims have been drawn to satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112 and to patentably distinguish the prior art of record.

The original claims 1 to 11 were rejected initially as being anticipated by or unpatentable over Kikuchi '218. We submit that when applying that reference against the original claims, the examiner misinterpreted the disclosure in that patent. More particularly in paragraph 7 of the action, the examiner asserted that Kikuchi discloses "a shielding device being substantially V-shaped and perforated". However, what appears to be holes in Kikuchi's reflection mirrors 25 are in reality semi-spherical protrusions; see pat. col. 4, line 2. In other words the elements 27 in Kikuchi are not holes or apertures in the mirror but rather dispersion means on the mirror surface to cause the deflected light to be dispersed so as to overcome any light emitting difference between different flash lamps; see pat. col. 3, line 66 et seq. Thus Kikuchi is deficient as a reference in two important respects. First, there is no disclosure in that reference of any type of heat shield and second there is no disclosure of anything that is perforated, let alone a heat shield.